arXiv:1610.02133v1 [math.FA] 7 Oct 2016

THE SPLIT FEASIBILITY AND FIXED POINT EQUALITY PROBLEMS FOR QUASI-NONEXPANSIVE MAPPINGS IN HILBERT SPACES

L.B. MOHAMMED AND A. KILIÇMAN

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a new problem called the split feasibility and fixed point equality problems (SFFPEP) and propose a new iterative algorithm for solving the problem (SFFPEP) for the class of quasi-nonexpansive mappings in Hilbert spaces. Furthermore, we study the convergence of the proposed algorithm. At the end, we give numerical example that illustrate our theoretical result. The SFFPEP is a generalization of the split feasibility problem (SFP), split feasibility and fixed point problems (SFFPP) and split equality fixed point problem (SEFPP).

1. Introduction

The split feasibility problem (SFP) in finite-dimensional Hilbert space was first introduced in 1994 by Censor and Elfving [4], this problem is useful to some area of applied mathematics, such as in convex optimization, image recovery, etc. Recently, it was found that the SFP can also be applied to study intensity-modulated radiation therapy; see, for example, [5–7] and the references therein. For many years, a wide variety of iterative methods has been used to approximate the solution of SFP, for example, see [10–13] and references therein.

The SFP is formulated as follows:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in C \text{ such that } y^* \in Q, \tag{1.1}$$

where C and Q are nonempty closed convex subset of Hilbert space H_1 and H_2, respectively, and $A : H_1 \to H_2$ is a bounded linear operator.

The split feasibility and fixed point problems (SFFPP) is required to find a vector

$$x^* \in C \cap Fix(U) \text{ such that } Ax^* \in Q \cap Fix(T), \tag{1.2}$$

where $U : H_1 \to H_1$ and $T : H_2 \to H_2$ are two nonlinear mappings, and $A : H_1 \to H_2$ is a bounded linear operator. It is easy to see that Problem (1.2) reduces to the Problem (1.1) as $C := Fix(U)$ and $Q := Fix(T)$. Therefore, it is worth to mentioned here that Problem (1.2) generalizes Problem (1.1).

The split equality fixed point problems (SEFPP) was introduced by Moudafi [1] and it takes the following form:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in C \text{ and } y^* \in Q \text{ such that } Ax^* = By^*. \tag{1.3}$$

where $A : H_1 \to H_3$ and $B : H_2 \to H_3$ are two bounded linear operators, C and Q be a nonempty closed convex subset of H_1 and H_2, respectively. It is easy to

Date: October 10, 2016.

Key words and phrases. Iterative Algorithm. Quasi-nonexpansive. Split Feasibility Problem. Weak Convergence.

see that Problem (1.3) reduces to Problem (1.1) as $H_2 = H_3$ and $B = I$ (I is the identity operator on H_2) in (1.3). Therefore Problem (1.3) proposed by Moudafi [1] is a generalization of Problem (1.1).

We now introduce a new problem called the split feasibility and fixed point equality problems (SFFPEP), this is fomulated as:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in C \cap Fix(U) \text{ and } y^* \in Q \cap Fix(T) \text{ such that } Ax^* = By^*, \tag{1.4}$$

where $U : H_1 \to H_1$ and $T : H_2 \to H_2$ are two quasi-nonexpansive mappings with $Fix(U) \neq \emptyset$ and $Fix(T) \neq \emptyset$, $A : H_1 \to H_3$ and $B : H_2 \to H_3$ are two bounded linear operators, C and Q are two nonempty closed convex subset of H_1 and H_2, respectively.

Note that if $C := Fix(U)$ and $Q := Fix(T)$, then, Problem (1.4) reduces to Problem (1.3) and also reduces to Problem (1.2) as $H_2 = H_3$ and $B = I$ (I stands for the identity operator on H_2) in (1.4). In the light of this, it worth to mention here that the SFFPEP generalizes the SFP, SFFPP and SEFPP. Therefore, the results and conclusions that are true for the SFFPEP continue to holds for these problems (SFP, SFFPP and SEFPP) and it definitely shows the significance and the range of applicability of SFFPEP.

In order to approximate the solution of SEFPP (1.2), Moudafi and Al-Shemas [2] introduced the following simultaneous iterative methods which generate a sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ by

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = U(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n), \\ \\ y_{n+1} = T(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n), \forall n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

where $U : H_1 \to H_1$, $T : H_2 \to H_2$ are two firmly quasi-nonexpansive mappings, $A : H_1 \to H_3$, $B : H_2 \to H_3$ are two bounded linear operators with their adjoints A^* and B^*, respectively, $\lambda_n \subset \left(\epsilon, \frac{2}{L_{A^*A}L_{B^*B}}\right)$, L_{A^*A} and L_{B^*B} denote the spectral radius of the operators A^*A and B^*B, respectively.

Noticing that projection operators have very attractive properties that make them particularly well suited for iterative algorithms, for example, see [3]. By setting $U = P_C$ and $T = P_Q$, where P_C and P_Q denote the metric projection of H_1 and H_2 onto C and Q, respectively. Trivially, Algorithm (1.5) reduces to the following simultaneous iterative method:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n), \\ \\ y_{n+1} = P_Q(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n), \forall n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

this algorithm was investigated in [14] by means of the projected Landweber's algorithm. We already mentioned that if $B = I$, Problem (1.3) reduces to the classical SFP (1.1), and if in addition, $\lambda_n = \lambda = 1$, the second equation of Algorithm (1.6) reduces to $y_{n+1} = P_Q(Ax_n)$ while the first equation gives the following algorithm:

$$x_{n+1} = P_C(x_n - \lambda A^*(I - P_Q)Ax_n), \tag{1.7}$$

Algorithm (1.7) is exactly the algorithm proposed by Byrne for more details, see [10] and reference therein.

Very recently, Yuan et al., [9], modified the algorithm of Moudafi and Al-Shemas [2] and considered the following algorithm:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)x_n + \alpha_n U(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n), \\ \\ y_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)y_n + \alpha_n T(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n), \forall n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

where $U, T,\ A, A^*,\ B, B^*,\ \lambda_n,\ L_{A^*A}$ and L_{B^*B} as in Algorithm (1.5), and $\alpha_n \subset [\alpha, 1]$ for $\alpha > 0$. By imposing some appropriate conditions on parameters and the operators involved, they proved a weak convergence result and they also obtained strong convergence result by imposing semicomfactness conditions.

In 2015, Chidume et al., [15] modified Algorithm (1.8) and considered the following algorithm:

$$\begin{cases} u_n = x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n) \\ x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha)u_n + \alpha U u_n, \\ \\ r_n = y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n) \\ y_{n+1} = (1-\alpha)r_n + \alpha T r_n, \forall n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

where U, T, are two demicontractive mappings, $A, A^*,\ B, B^*,\ \lambda_n,\ L_{A^*A}$ and L_{B^*B} as in Algorithm (1.8), and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Under some appropriate conditions, they also proved a weak convergence result and strong convergence follows only if U, and T are semi-compacts.

To solve Problem (1.2), Chen et al., [8] introduced the following Ishikawa extragradient iterative methods which generate a sequence $\{x_n\}$ by:

$$\begin{cases} x_0 \in C \ \text{ chosen arbitrarily}, \\ y_n = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(I - UP_Q)Ax_n), \\ z_n = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(I - UP_Q)Ay_n), \\ w_n = (1-\beta_n)z_n + \beta_n T z_n, \\ x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)z_n + \alpha_n T w_n, \forall n \geq 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

where $\lambda_n \subset (0, \frac{1}{2\|A\|^2})$ and $\beta_n, \alpha_n \subset (0, 1)$ such that $0 < a < \beta_n < c < \alpha_n < \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+L^2}+1}$, U is a nonexpansive mapping and T is L-Lipschitzian pseudocontractive mapping.

Motivated and inspired by the work of; Moudafi [1], Moudafi and Al-Shemas [2], Chen et al., [8], Byrne [10], Yuan et al., [9] and Chidume et al., [15], we further propose the following algorithm to solve the split feasibility and fixed point equality problems (1.4) in the case where U and T are quasi-nonexpansive mappings.

$$\begin{cases} x_1 \in H_1 \text{ and } x_2 \in H_2; \\ z_n = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n)), \\ w_n = (1-\beta_n)z_n + \beta_n U(z_n), \\ x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)z_n + \alpha_n U(w_n), \\ \\ u_n = P_Q(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n)), \\ r_n = (1-\beta_n)u_n + \beta_n T(u_n), \\ y_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)u_n + \alpha_n T(r_n), \forall n \geq 1, \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

where $0 < a < \beta_n < 1$, $0 < b < \alpha_n < 1$, and $\lambda_n \in \left(0, \frac{2}{L_1+L_2}\right)$, where L_1 and L_2 denote the spectral radius of the operators A^*A and B^*B, respectively.

It is important to know that the class of quasi-nonexpansive mapping generalizes the class of firmly quasi-nonexpansive mappings studied by Moudafi and

Al-Shemas [2]. Under some appropriate conditions imposed on the parameters and operators involved, we proved a weak convergence results of the proposed algorithms. Furthermore, we gave numerical example that illustrate our theoretical results. The results presented in this paper, improve, extend and generalize a number of well-known results annouced.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we present some definitions and lemmas which will be use in proving our main result.

Let H be a Hilbert space and $T : H \to H$ be a map with $Fix(T) = \{x \in H : Tx = x\} \neq \emptyset$. T is said to be; nonexpansive, if

$$\|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in H,$$

quasi-nonexpansive, if

$$\|Tx - q\| \leq \|x - q\|, \forall x \in H \text{ and } q \in Fix(T),$$

firmly quasi-nonexpansive, if

$$\|Tx - q\|^2 \leq \|x - q\|^2 - \|Tx - x\|^2, \forall x \in H \text{ and } q \in Fix(T).$$

And also T is said to be demiclosed at 0, if for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ in H such that x_n converges weakly to x and Tx_n converges strongly to 0, then it implies that $Tx = 0$. And it is said to be semi-compact, if for any bounded sequence $\{x_n\} \subset H$ with $(I - T)x_n$ converges strongly to 0, there exists a sub-sequence say $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\{x_{n_k}\}$ converges strongly to 0.

Lemma 2.1. (Opial [17]) *Let H be a real Hilbert space and $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in H such that there exists a nonempty set $C \subset H$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *For each $x \in C$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|x_n - x\|$ exists,*
(ii) *Any weak-cluster point of the sequence $\{x_n\}$ belongs to C.*

Then, there exists $y \in C$ such that $\{x_n\}$ converges weakly to y.

In sequel, adopt the following notations:

(i) I : The identity operator on a Hilbert space H,
(ii) $Fix(T)$: The fixed point set of T i.e., $Fix(T) = \{x \in H : Tx = x\}$,
(iii) " $\to$ "and " $\rightharpoonup$ " The strong and weak covergence, respectively,
(iv) $\omega_\omega(x_n)$: The set of the cluster point of $\{x_n\}$ in the weak topology i.e., { there exists $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $x_{n_k} \rightharpoonup x$},
(v) Ω : The solution set of Problem (1.4), i.e.,

$$\Omega = \Big\{ \text{Find } x^* \in C \cap Fix(U) \text{ and } y^* \in Q \cap Fix(T) \text{ such that } Ax^* = By^* \Big\}. \tag{2.1}$$

3. Main Results

To approximate the solution of split feasibility and fixed point equality problems (2.1), we make the following assumptions:

(B_1) H_1, H_2, H_3, are real Hilbert spaces, C and Q are two nonempty closed convex subset of H_1 and H_2, respectively.
(B_2) $U : H_1 \to H_1$ and $T : H_2 \to H_2$ are two quasi-nonexpansive mappings with $Fix(U) \neq \emptyset$ and $Fix(T) \neq \emptyset$.

(B_3) $A : H_1 \to H_3$ and $B : H_2 \to H_3$ are two bounded linear operators with their adjoints A^* and B^*, respectively.
(B_4) $(U - I)$ and $(T - I)$ are demiclosed at zero.
(B_5) P_C and P_Q are metric projection of H_1 and H_2 onto C and Q, respectively.
(B_6) For arbitrary $x_1 \in H_1$ and $y_1 \in H_2$, define a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ by:

$$\begin{cases} z_n = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n)), \\ w_n = (1-\beta_n)z_n + \beta_n U(z_n), \\ x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)z_n + \alpha_n U(w_n), \\ \\ u_n = P_Q(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n)), \\ r_n = (1-\beta_n)u_n + \beta_n T(u_n), \\ y_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)u_n + \alpha_n T(r_n), \forall n \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $0 < a < \beta_n < 1$, $0 < b < \alpha_n < 1$, and $\lambda_n \in \left(0, \frac{2}{L_1+L_2}\right)$, where L_1 and L_2 denote the spectral radius of the operators A^*A and B^*B, respectively.

We are now in the position to state and prove our main result.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that assumptions $(B_1) - (B_6)$ are satisfied, in addition assume that the solution set $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Then, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ generated by Algorithm (3.1) converges weakly to $(x^*, y^*)\Omega$.*

Proof. Let $(x^*, y^*) \in \Omega$, by (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \|(1-\alpha_n)(z_n - x^*) + \alpha_n(Uw_n - x^*)\|^2 \\ &= (1-\alpha_n)\|z_n - x^*\|^2 + \alpha_n\|Uw_n - x^*\|^2 - \alpha_n(1-\alpha_n)\|Uw_n - z_n\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-\alpha_n)\|z_n - x^*\|^2 + \alpha_n\|w_n - x^*\|^2 - \alpha_n(1-\alpha_n)\|Uw_n - z_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_n - x^*\|^2 &= \|(1-\beta_n)(z_n - x^*) + \beta_n(Uz_n - x^*)\|^2 \\ &= (1-\beta_n)\|z_n - x^*\|^2 + \beta_n\|Uz_n - x^*\|^2 - \beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|Uz_n - z_n\|^2 \\ &\leq \|z_n - x^*\|^2 - \beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|Uz_n - z_n\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_n - x^*\|^2 &= \|P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n)) - P_C(x^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n) - x^*\|^2 \\ &= \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - 2\lambda_n\langle Ax_n - Ax^*, Ax_n - By_n\rangle + \lambda_n^2 L_1\|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

From (3.2) – (3.4), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 &- 2\lambda_n\langle Ax_n - Ax^*, Ax_n - By_n\rangle + \lambda_n^2 L_1\|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \\ &- \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|U(z_n) - z_n\|^2 - \alpha_n(1-\alpha_n)\|Uw_n - z_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Similarly, the second equation of Equation (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{n+1} - y^*\|^2 \leq \|y_n - y^*\|^2 &+ 2\lambda_n\langle By_n - By^*, Ax_n - By_n\rangle + \lambda_n^2 L_2\|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \\ &- \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|T(u_n) - u_n\|^2 - \alpha_n(1-\alpha_n)\|Tr_n - u_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

By (3.5), (3.6) and noticing that $Ax^* = By^*$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 + \|y_{n+1} - y^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 + \|y_n - y^*\|^2 - 2\lambda_n \|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \\ + \lambda_n^2(L_1 + L_2)\|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \\ - \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|U(z_n) - z_n\|^2 \\ - \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|T(u_n) - u_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Thus, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{n+1} \leq \Omega_n - \lambda_n\left(2 - \lambda_n^2(L_1 + L_2)\right)\|Ax_n - By_n\|^2 \\ - \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|U(z_n) - z_n\|^2 - \alpha_n\beta_n(1-\beta_n)\|T(u_n) - u_n\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\Omega_n := \|x_n - x^*\|^2 + \|y_n - y^*\|^2.$$

Thus, $\{\Omega_n\}$ is a non-increasing sequence and bounded below by 0, therefore, it converges.

From (3.8) and the fact that $\{\Omega_n\}$ converges, we deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Ax_n - By_n\| = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Uz_n - z_n\| = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \|Tu_n - u_n\| = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Furthermore, since $\{\Omega_n\}$ converges, this ensures that $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ also converges.

Now, let $(x, y) \in \Omega$, this implies that $x \in C \cap Fix(U)$ and $y \in Q \cap Fix(T)$ such that $Ax = By$.

The fact that $x_n \rightharpoonup x$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Ax_n - By_n\| = 0$ together with

$$z_n = P_C(x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n)),$$

we deduce that $z_n \rightharpoonup P_C x$. Since $x \in C$, by projection theorem, we obtain that $P_C x = x$. Hence, $z_n \rightharpoonup x$.

Similarly, The fact that $y_n \rightharpoonup y$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Ax_n - By_n\| = 0$ together with

$$u_n = P_Q(y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n)),$$

we deduce that $u_n \rightharpoonup P_Q x$. Since $x \in Q$, by projection theorem, we obtain that $P_Q y = y$. Hence, $u_n \rightharpoonup y$.

Now, $z_n \rightharpoonup x$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Uz_n - z_n\| = 0$ together with the demiclosed of $(U - I)$ at zero, we deduce that $x \in Fix(U)$ which implies that $x \in Fix(U)$.

On the other hand, $u_n \rightharpoonup y$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Tu_n - u_n\| = 0$ together with the demiclosed of $(T - I)$ at zero, we deduce that $y \in Fix(T)$ which implies that $y \in Fix(T)$.

Since $z_n \rightharpoonup x$, $u_n \rightharpoonup y$ and the fact that A and B are bounded linear operators, we have

$$Az_n \rightharpoonup Ax \text{ and } Bu_n \rightharpoonup By,$$

This implies that

$$Az_n - Bu_n \rightharpoonup Ax - By,$$

which turn to implies that

$$\|Ax - By\| \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \|Az_n - Bu_n\| = 0,$$

which further implies that $Ax = By$. Noticing that $x \in C$, $x \in Fix(U)$, $y \in Q$ and $y \in Fix(T)$, we have that $x \in C \cap Fix(U)$ and $y \in Q \cap Fix(T)$. Hence, we conclude that $(x, y) \in \Omega$.

Summing up, we have proved that:

(i) for each $(x^*, x^*) \in \Omega$, the $\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\|x_n - x^*\|^2 + \|y_n - y^*\|^2 \right)$ exists;
(ii) each weak cluster of the sequence (x_n, y_n) belongs to Ω.

Thus, by Lemma (2.1) we conclude that the sequences (x_n, y_n) converges weakly to $(x^*, x^*) \in \Omega$. And the proof is complete. □

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that all the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and in addition, U and T are semi-compacts, then, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ converges strongly to $(x^*, y^*) \in \Omega$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, $\{u_n\}$ and $\{z_n\}$ are bounded, by (3.10) and the fact that U and T are semi-compacts, then there exists a sub-sequences $\{u_{n_k}\}$ and $\{z_{n_k}\}$ (suppose without loss of generality) of $\{u_n\}$ and $\{z_n\}$ such that $u_{n_k} \to x$ and $z_{n_k} \to y$. Since, $u_n \rightharpoonup x^*$ and $z_n \rightharpoonup y^*$, we have $x = x^*$ and $y = y^*$. By (3.9) and the fact that $u_{n_k} \to x^*$ and $z_{n_k} \to y^*$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Ax^* - Ay^*\| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|Au_{n_k} - Bz_{n_k}\| = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

which turn to implies that $Ax^* = Ay^*$. Hence $(x^*, y^*) \in \Omega$. Thus, the iterative algorithm of Theorem 3.1 conveges strongly to the solution of Problem 2.1. □

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that conditions $(B_1) - (B_6)$ are satisfied and let the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ be generated by Algorithm (3.1). Assume that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ and let U and T be a firmly of quasi-nonexpansive mappings. Then, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ generated by Algorithm (3.1) converges weakly to the solution set of Problem (2.1).*

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose that conditions*

$$(B_1) - (B_5)$$

are satisfied are satisfied and let the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ be generated by

$$\begin{cases} z_n = x_n - \lambda_n A^*(Ax_n - By_n), \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - \alpha_n)z_n + \alpha_n U(z_n), \\ \\ u_n = y_n + \lambda_n B^*(Ax_n - By_n), \\ y_{n+1} = (1 - \alpha_n)u_n + \alpha_n T(_n), \forall n \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

where $0 < a < \beta_n < 1$, and $\lambda_n \in \left(0, \frac{2}{L_1 + L_2}\right)$, where L_1 and L_2 denote the spectral radius of the operators A^*A and B^*B, respectively. Assume that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Then, the sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ generated by Algorithm (3.12) converges weakly to the solution of SEFPP (1.3).

Proof. Trivially, Algorithm (3.1) reduces to Algorithm (3.12) as $\beta = 0$, $P_C = P_Q = I$ and SFFPEP (1.4) reduces to SEFPP (1.3) as $C := Fix(U)$ and $Q := Fix(T)$. Therefore, all the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Hence, the proof of this corollary follows directly from Theorem 3.1. □

4. Numerical Example

In this section, we give a numerical example to illustrate our theoretical results.

Example 4.1. Let $H_1 = \Re$ with the inner product defined by $\langle x, y\rangle = xy$ for all $x, y \in \Re$ and $\|.\|$ stand for the corresponding norm. Let $C := [0, \infty)$, $Q := [0, \infty)$ and define a mappings $T : C \to \Re$ and $S : Q \to \Re$ by $Tx = \frac{x^2+5}{1+x}$, for all $x \in C$ and $Sx = \frac{x+5}{5}$, for all $x \in Q$. Then T and S are quasi nonexpansive mappings.

Proof. Trivially, $Fix(T) = 5$ and $Fix(S) = \frac{5}{4}$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |Tx - 5| &= \left|\frac{x^2+5}{1+x} - 5\right| = \frac{x}{1+x}\,|x-5| \\ &\leq |x-5|\,. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|Sx - \frac{5}{4}\right| &= \left|\frac{x+5}{5} - \frac{5}{4}\right| = \frac{1}{5}\left|x - \frac{5}{4}\right| \\ &\leq |x-5|\,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, T and S are quasi-nonexpansive mappings. □

Example 4.2. Let $H_1 = \Re$ with the inner product defined by $\langle x, y\rangle = xy$ for all $x, y \in \Re$ and $\|.\|$ stand for the corresponding norm. Let $C := [0, \infty)$, $Q := [0, \infty)$ and define a mappings $U : C \to \Re$ and $T : Q \to \Re$ by $Ux = \frac{x^2+5}{1+x}$, for all $x \in C$ and $Tx = \frac{x+5}{5}$, for all $x \in Q$. And also let $P_C = P_Q = I$, $Ax = x$, $By = 4y$, $\lambda_n = 1$, $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{5}$, $\beta_n = \frac{1}{8}$ and $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ be the sequence generated by

$$\begin{cases} x_0 \in C \text{ and } y_0 \in Q, \\ z_n = P_C(x_n - A^*(x_n - 4y_n)), \\ w_n = (1 - \frac{1}{8})z_n + \frac{1}{8}U(z_n), \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - \frac{1}{5})z_n + \frac{1}{5}U(w_n), \\ \\ u_n = P_Q(y_n + B^*(x_n - 4y_n)), \\ r_n = (1 - \frac{1}{8})u_n + \frac{1}{8}T(u_n), \\ y_{n+1} = (1 - \frac{1}{5})u_n + \frac{1}{5}T(r_n), \forall n \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Then, $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ converges to $(5, 5/4) \in \Omega$.

Proof. By Example 4.1 U and T are quasi-nonexpansive mappings. Clearly, A and B are bounded linear operator on $\Re$ with $A = A^* = 1$ and $B = B^* = 4$, respectively. Furthermore, it is easy to see that $Fix(U) = 5$ and $Fix(T) = \frac{5}{4}$. Hence,

$$\Omega = \Big\{5 \in C \cap Fix(U) \text{ and } 5/4 \in Q \cap Fix(T) \text{ such that } A(5) = B(5/4)\Big\}.$$

After simplification, Algorithm (4.1) reduces to

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
x_0 \in C \text{ and } y_0 \in Q, \\
z_n = x_n, \\
w_n = \frac{7}{8} z_n + \frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{z_n^2+5}{z_n+1}\right), \\
x_{n+1} = \frac{4}{5} z_n + \frac{1}{5}\left(\frac{w_n^2+5}{w_n+1}\right), \\
\\
u_n = y_n, \\
r_n = \frac{7}{8} u_n + \frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{u_n+5}{5}\right), \\
y_{n+1} = \frac{4}{5} u_n + \frac{1}{5}\left(\frac{r_n+5}{5}\right), \forall n \geq 0.
\end{array}
\right. \tag{4.2}
$$

TABLE 1. Starting with initial values $x_0 = 10$ and $y_0 = 15$

n	x_n	y_n
0	10.00000000	15.00000000
1	9.898293685	12.74500000
2	9.797736851	10.85982000
3	9.698337655	9.283809520
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
248	5.001051418	1.250000002
249	5.001012726	1.250000002
250	5.000975458	1.250000002

FIGURE 1. The convergence of $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ with the initial value $x_0 = 10$ and $y_0 = 15$



□

TABLE 2. Starting with initial values $x_0 = 5$ and $y_0 = 1.25$

n	x_n	y_n
0	5.000000000	1.250000000
1	5.000000000	1.250000000
2	5.000000000	1.250000000
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
98	5.000000000	1.250000000
99	5.000000000	1.250000000
100	5.000000000	1.250000000

FIGURE 2. The convergence of $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ with the initial value $x_0 = 5$ and $y_0 = 1.25$



5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce a new problem called split feasibility and fixed point equality problems (SFFPEP) and study it for the class of quasi-nonexpansive mappings in Hilbert spaces. Under some suitable assumptions imposed on the parameters and operators involved, we proved a weak convergence theorem of the propose problem. Furthermore, we gives a numerical example that illustrate our theoretical result. The results presented in this paper, extend and complement the results of; Moudafi [1], Moudafi and Al-Shemas [2], Chen et al., [8], Byrne [10], Yuan et al., [9] and Chidume et al., [15].

The split feasibility and fixed point equality problem (SFFPEP) is a very interesting topic. Its generalizes the split feasibility problem (SFP), fixed point problem (FPP), split feasibilty and fixed point problem (SFFPP) and split equality fixed point problem (SEFPP) . All the results and conclusions that are true for the split

feasibility and fixed point equality problem (SFFPEP) continue to holds for these problems (SFP,FPP,SFFPP and SEFPP) and it definitely shows the significance and the range of applicability of split feasibility and fixed point equality problem (SFFPEP).

Remark 5.1. Theorem 3.2 gives a strong convergence result for the class of quasi-nonexpansive mappings with the assumption that each mapping is a semi-compact. This compactness type condition appeared very strong as only few mapping are semi-compact.

This leads us to think of the following question:

(i) Can the strong convergence of Theorem 3.1 be obtain without imposing the semi-compactness conditions?

(ii) If the above answer is affirmative, can the strong convergence hold for the class of infinite family of quasi-nonexpansive mappings?

This will be our future research.

References

[1] Moudafi, A. (2014). Alternating CQ-algorithm for convex feasibility and split fixed-point problems. J. Nonlinear Convex Anal, 15(4), 809–818.

[2] Moudafi, A., & Al-Shemas, E. (2013). Simultaneous iterative methods for split equality problem. Trans. Math. Program. Appl, 1(2), 1–11.

[3] Moudafi, A. (2002). Mixed equilibrium problems: sensitivity analysis and algorithmic aspect. Computers & Mathematics with Applications, 44(8), 1099–1108.

[4] Censor, Y., & Elfving, T. (1994). A multiprojection algorithm using Bregman projections in a product space. Numerical Algorithms, 8(2), 221–239.

[5] Censor, Y., Bortfeld, T., Martin, B., & Trofimov, A. (2006). A unified approach for inversion problems in intensity-modulated radiation therapy. Physics in Medicine and Biology, 51(10), 2353–2365.

[6] Censor, Y., Elfving, T., Kopf, N., & Bortfeld, T. (2005). The multiple-sets split feasibility problem and its applications for inverse problems. Inverse Problems, 21(6), 2071–2084.

[7] Censor, Y., Motova, A., & Segal, A. (2007). Perturbed projections and subgradient projections for the multiple-sets split feasibility problem. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 327(2), 1244–1256.

[8] Chen, J. Z., Ceng, L. C., Qiu, Y. Q., & Kong, Z. R. (2015). Extra-gradient methods for solving split feasibility and fixed point problems. Fixed Point Theory and Applications, 2015(1), 1–21.

[9] Ma, Y. F., Wang, L., & Zi, X. J. (2013). Strong and weak convergence theorems for a new split feasibility problem. In Int. Math. Forum 8(33), 1621–1627.

[10] Byrne, C. (2002). Iterative oblique projection onto convex sets and the split feasibility problem. Inverse Problems, 18(2),441–453.

[11] Byrne, C. (2003). A unified treatment of some iterative algorithms in signal processing and image reconstruction. Inverse problems, 20(1), 103-120.

[12] Xu, H. K. (2010). Iterative methods for the split feasibility problem in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Inverse Problems, 26(10), 105018.

[13] Qu, B., & Xiu, N. (2005). A note on the CQ algorithm for the split feasibility problem. Inverse Problems, 21(5), 1655–1665.

[14] Byrne, C., & Moudafi, A. (2013). Extensions of the CQ algorithm for the split feasibility and split equality problems. Nonlinear and Convex Anal.

[15] Chidume, C. E., Ndambomve, P., & Bello, U. A. (2015). The split equality fixed point problem for demicontractive mappings. Journal of Nonlinear Analysis and Optimization: Theory & Applications, 6(1), 61–69.

[16] He, Z., & Du, W. S. (2012). Nonlinear algorithms approach to split common solution problems. Fixed Point Theory and Applications, 2012(1), 1–14.

[17] Opial, Z. (1967). Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximations for nonexpansive mappings. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 73(4), 591–597.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang Selangor, Malaysia.
E-mail address: akilicman@science.upm.edu.my, lawanbulama@gmail.com